Original Paper

Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) in Teacher Education: Reflections and Future Direction

Thomas J. Martinek[1], Fernando Santos[2*], César Sá[3] & Linda Saraiva[4]

[1] University of North Carolina, Department of Kinesiology, United States

[2] Polytechnic Institute of Porto and Viana do Castelo, School of Higher Education, inED Centre for Research and Innovation in Education, Portugal

[3] Polytechnic Institute of Viana do Castelo, School of Higher Education, Portugal

[4] Polytechnic Institute of Viana do Castelo, School of Higher Education, CIEC - Research Center for Child Studies of the University of Minho, Portugal

[*] Correspondence, Fernando Santos, Polytechnic Institute of Porto and Viana do Castelo, School of Higher Education, inED Centre for Research and Innovation in Education, Portugal

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to provide insights about the implementation of Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility-focused teacher training and shed light on practical and theoretical implications. Our reflections highlight that any professional preparation program that is committed to preparing teachers will choose the best way to promote learning. We have in mind that careful consideration for community involvement, having authentic commitment to Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility, being well informed about best practices and getting the teacher education student to "step outside the box" may be all important elements for success. Future challenges include delivering and assessing the impact of Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility-focused teacher training programs.

Keywords

youth, positive youth development, physical education, teacher training

1. Introduction

Throughout the last decades, many studies (McLennan & Thompson, 2015; Wright & Irwin, 2018) have been conducted to understand how to structure high quality Physical Education (PE). Further, changes to the current *status quo* in many education systems across the globe have been considered a priority and a necessity if PE is to be valued and used to develop the whole person (Casey & Larsson,

2018; Ennis, 2011). PE has been considered as a discipline that can foster physical as well as personal and social development (Dyson, 2014). Indeed, it has been noted that PE has the power to develop a range of personal and social skills such as emotional control and leadership (Martinek & Hellison, 2009). More specifically, PE can be considered an optimal context to foster these types of outcomes as teachable moments emerge constantly. For example, when working in pairs on a motor task there are opportunities for teachers to have students teach or lead each other (i.e., reciprocal teaching). On the other hand, we need also to acknowledge that PE and sport can have a neutral effect on students' personal and social development and, in some cases, lead to undesirable behaviors such as cheating and lack of social skills in other life domains (Fraser-Thomas, Côté, & Deakin, 2005). Considering these potential developmental outcomes, there is the need to understand how to attain these outcomes. The challenges that teacher education programs and teachers face in acquiring these outcomes must also be addressed.

The current *status quo* in many countries reflects a lack of value and importance provided to PE in comparison to other content areas of a school's curriculum (Cardinal, Yan, & Cardinal, 2013; Simmons & MacLean, 2018; Yli-Piipari, 2014). Further, many policy makers and even some PE professionals have a narrow perspective toward PE whereas physical development is the only deliberate pursuit. The expressions "PE develops character" and "PE develops the person" reflect an optimistic perspective toward PE that may not translate into actual practice (Curtner-Smith, 1999). Many studies have explored how PE can be deliberately structured to develop the whole person and foster physical, personal, social and cognitive development (Escartí Llopis-Goig, & Wright, 2018; Farias, Wallhead, & Mesquita, 2019). These studies have shown that youth can learn a variety of meaningful personal and social skills useful in PE that can be applied in other life domains. There are no doubts that PE teachers' deliberate efforts towards personal and social development are highly important for better developmental outcomes (Martinek & Hellison, 2016).

Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility: More Than a Model…

Within the search for potential pedagogical approaches that may help teachers structure relevant experiences for youth in PE, several researchers have taken the whole person approach and, subsequently, provided insight about how various instructional models may be utilized to frame PE teachers' intervention efforts (Gordon, 2009; Hellison, 2011; Metzler, 2011). The Sport Education (Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000) model is one example of a student-centered instructional model that aims to foster physical and motor skill development alongside personal development. Recent studies have examined how the sport education model may influence transfer to other life domains due to the meaning behind students' lived experiences in PE (Farias, Hastie, & Mesquita, 2017; Farias et al., 2019).

Another example is the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility (TPSR) model designed by Hellison (2011) which also reflects a student-centered approach whereas personal and social responsibility is deliberately taught to youth through physical activity experiences. Hellison's (2011)

33

work has left an important legacy on how to empower youth for their personal and social development through a carefully structured environment. His life work continues to influence programming across the world. TPSR has been used in a variety of countries and populations with promising results such as increased leadership skills and life prospects (Camerino, Valero-Valenzuela, Prat, Sánchez, & Castañer, 2019; Hemphill, Templin, & Wright, 2015; Merino-Barrero, Pedreño, Valenzuela, & Fernandez-Rio, 2019; Severinsen, 2014).

Although the expression "TPSR model" has been commonly used in various studies, projects, and discussion forums, Hellison's (2011) contributions and intentions were to showcase how TPSR represented a philosophy towards youth where their developmental needs were the primary foci within physical activity programming (Martinek & Hellison, 2016). The spirit TPSR embraces is the idea that youth need to be empowered and presented with concrete opportunities to develop personal and social skills such as respect for the right of feelings of others, participation/effort, self-direction, and leadership within an empowering climate. The final aspect of Hellison's (2011) model is to foster a youth's ability to apply the TPSR skills outside the gym and contribute to the community.

TPSR requires that teachers explicitly focus on responsibility goals and systematically integrate them into PE content. In some cases, PE curricula does not reflect an explicit approach towards personal and social development. This often leaves PE teachers alone to search for the best teaching approach. Nevertheless, PE teachers may create positive experiences for youth and develop a range of personal and social skills. TPSR is not the only suitable approach and is not for every teacher and program, and not necessarily a panacea for PE and society's challenges. TPSR may be deemed a useful approach in PE programs that embrace a philosophy that places youth's developmental needs as a primary focus. In line with TPSR's mission, teachers (a) need to set clear expectations, (b) use physical and sport activities to explicitly develop personal and social skills, (c) create awareness about how personal and social skills may be used in and outside PE through group meetings, and (d) provide opportunities for guided reflection.

Teacher Training and Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility

A key issue with TPSR implementation is how to create sustainable TPSR programs that provide long-lasting opportunities to gain a sense of what it means to be responsible people (Hemphill et al., 2015). As TPSR expands to diverse cultures and countries, this issue has become increasingly more relevant (Alcalá, Río, Calvo, & Pueyo, 2019; Escartí et al., 2012). Therefore, teacher education has been used to help PE teachers follow Hellison's (2011) guidelines and increase their ability to make an impact on schools, students, and communities. If sustainable TPSR programs are to be created, teacher programs need to be framed in a way where teachers develop a TPSR philosophy and identify themselves with the pedagogical principles behind TPSR. However, as indicated by Hellison (2011), one cannot force teachers to relinquish their beliefs in traditional practices and commit to TPSR values. Instead, efforts can be developed to help teachers understand how to transform each of their students and help them strive in PE and, equally importantly, later in life.

34

Thus, teacher education could be viewed as a means to change the dynamics experienced in schools, influence youths' outcomes and therefore impact communities. A TPSR-focused teacher education program may (a) provide solid grounds for prospective teachers to put youth's developmental needs first and (b) consider students' as agents of change that need to be prepared for the complex social challenges in communities such as increased discrimination and intolerance. Successful TPSR-focused teacher education means preservice teachers are prepared to infuse TPSR in school programs and gradually create a culture where their students' developmental needs are valued.

We should have in mind that this transformative power present in teacher education programs has been extensively discussed in the past, but there are still many challenges while integrating research into practice and policy (Ezer, Gilat, & Sagee, 2010; Lopes & Pereira, 2012). Few changes have been operated in many contexts throughout the last decades (Curtner-Smith, 1999). TPSR, as a philosophy focused on the "whole person," is viewed as an overarching framework for some teacher education programs. However, if there is not a strong belief that this transformative power exists within teacher education programs, reforms and policies may not significantly have an impact on preservice teachers. For example, it may be unlikely that a prospective teacher learns how to foster TPSR through PE in a 12-hour module throughout a three-year course of study. Hence, a reflection about what TPSR means, PE and teacher education are warranted to map the roles and responsibilities of education systems that wish to use TPSR or other approaches to foster better developmental outcomes. Such reflections may enable teachers, in the long run, to be authentic active contributors to society.

Purpose

We acknowledge that, in order to move TPSR forward in PE programming, it is necessary to provide insights on *how* teacher education can best prepare teachers to deliver TPSR programs in schools. Adding to Dunn and Doolittle's (2020) contributions about how physical education teachers and other education professionals learn TPSR, we suggest there is the need to reflect on *how* and *why* TPSR may be used in some cases as a guiding philosophy for teacher education programs. Considering the vast array of learning sources mentioned by Dunn and Doolittle (2020), the purpose of this article is to provide insights about the implementation of TPSR-focused teacher education programs and shed light on practical implications.

Social Forces and Teacher Development Systems: Moving Towards TPSR

Professional development and teacher education programs have typically been guided by a set of guidelines (i.e., state and national teaching standards). Students are in many cases required to follow a strict program of study along with traditional lesson planning and various teaching strategies. The focal points of the content usually are on game skills and fitness development. As preservice teachers enter their first-year teaching position, especially in secondary schools, some may find fellow some staff and administrators indifferent about providing quality learning experiences for students. The disconnect between what they received in their preservice training and the reality of the school's program is fully realized--something that does not bode well for their teacher education program and the way they were

35

prepared to teach in schools. Although this may not be the case in all PE programs, it illustrates an unfortunate downfall (and challenge) in many teacher education programs.

The nature of TPSR and its connection to values-based teaching lends itself to a more focused and empowering way of teacher preparation. Other models that are values-based (e.g., Sport Education, Adventure/Outdoor Education) have their place in alternative curricula instruction. For TPSR, however, certain principles have to come into play. Reflection, relationship building, empowerment, and transfer become the cornerstones of the preservice teacher's experience. Understanding these and what they mean may help make preservice teachers comfortable with an alternative way to teach PE—a way that may differ from the experiences had in their school PE programs. Commitment to TPSR can also be established so that something different can be offered in other secondary school jobs. Exposure to other instructional settings can also be included. Boys and Girls Clubs, community recreation centers, churches, and sport clubs are all part of the youth sport programming landscape. These settings are important for future teachers since their approach to working with kids has a significant impact on how theory will be perceived in their PE experience—especially one that is TPSR driven. We could also consider how preservice teachers bring into a teacher education program their beliefs, conceptions and experiences derived from past experienaces in PE and sport settings. Therefore, to bridge the gap between TPSR and past experiences, a reflexive component may need to be included to enable future teachers to problem solve and frame their approach to teaching TPSR.

There are several challenges in the program planning. One of these is to help students reflect on how TPSR fits their values and approach to teaching PE and, by doing so, create an openness to learning TPSR. Not all students may share TPSR's values and lean towards more teacher-centered approaches or other models. And yet, TPSR may provide a possible avenue for preservice teachers to explore through reflection and by examining PE program objectives which can create a sense of legitimacy towards TPSR. In other words, TPSR represents an alternative approach that can be discussed with preservice teachers where personal and social development is emphasized over motor skill and fitness-based approaches.   That is, realizing that a shift in the priority of *what* is to be taught may need to take place (Doolittle, 2011) where the focus would be on getting kids to be socially and personally responsible people through physical activity.

This brings in another challenge—to help teacher education students see that TPSR is an in-depth way of instruction, beyond just seeing it as a nontraditional way of teaching. In some cases, there is a tendency to use TPSR as a solution to all challenges and a new approach instead of a needed approach. In fact, TPSR may not fit every program and its teacher and is not better than other approaches. There are certainly various forms in the PE Teacher Education literature that show how to teach (e.g., Metzler, 2011; Rink, 2010) but there is little guidance offered in how you prepare teachers to recognize the value of physical activity programs that help kids get control of their lives (Doolittle, 2011). There has been an upsurge of the TPSR literature that has helped in configuring ways in which TPSR has been applied in both school and outside community settings (see Hellison & Wright 2002; Jacobs, Casteneda,

& Casteneda, 2016; McCarthy & Alteri, 2016; Beale, 2016). However, a question needs to be raised: How may preservice teachers buy-in into TPSR with less social-desirable effects?

A key feature in TPSR teacher education programs is making the connection to real world practice. Obviously, this requires that partnerships are formed with school programs so they become a part of the teacher preparation agenda. These partnerships then ensure that students get a hefty dose of clinical experiences in schools and other community programs and TPSR. These experiences also give preservice students opportunities to see the value of TPSR and its application. Developing these partnerships requires the seeking out of on-site personal who see themselves as viable aspects of the preservice teaching experience and also are open to a value based-approach to teaching kids. One of the challenges in doing this is to develop students' reflexive skills to an extent that enables them to go through socialization processes by interacting and observing other teachers and remaining aware of TPSR's core beliefs and principles. The lack of reflexive skills can, in some cases, lead to ineffective teaching practices and a narrow vision towards PE. This, in turn, may not be compatible with TPSR.

Connecting teacher education and students with real world practice brings meaning to the course experience and, at the same time, provides opportunity to try TPSR out in a meaningful way and reflect on how TPSR may or not be embedded in teaching practice (Dunn & Doolittle, 2020). However, teacher education faculty should also have in mind that these experiences need to be carefully designed as TPSR may be downsized and confused with a traditional approach to teaching PE. Learning and teaching TPSR is a process and takes time as teacher education students may have the opportunity to understand how to apply TPSR's core principles over the course of an undergraduate or graduate program. These core principles include focusing on youth's developmental needs, holistic self-development, empowerment and caring. In some cases, a challenge teachers face is the lack of time to let the teacher education student experiment and understand his/her own practices and how they fit with TPSR. Partnerships with schools and other institutions become part of the *community of practice* where all parties have a common interest in providing opportunities to reflect about an alternative way of learning based on the TPSR framework. A team of teacher education teachers who are familiarized with the key components of TPSR may use it to forge relationships with other exemplary teachers and their schools and engage students with quality TPSR programs.

All these challenges need to be acknowledged and dealt with so that learning is experiential and transferrable to real teaching scenarios and long lasting. Places and times become a factor in this process and will often dictate the "type" of experience the student will have. Here is where non-school time programs (e.g., Boys and Girls Clubs, community recreation programs, YMCAs) become a place for practice. Seeing a variety of settings will help to broaden the preservice student's awareness of the various contexts where physical activity instruction takes place. This approach may also broaden the notion that TPSR can be only used in specific contexts and create more opportunities for reflection and practice.

Preparing students to teach TPSR with the intention of involving them in applied experiences can be done in a number of ways. Methods and activity classes, internships, and student teaching are great venues that call for clinical engagement as discussed by Dunn and Doolittle (2020). Again, community partnerships become a vital part in all these approaches. Hopefully, they will help future teachers move beyond just seeing TPSR as just a theoretical add-on to their teacher preparation experience and, at the same time, create a culture in schools that align with TPSR principles where the model is welcomed and valued. A starting point for identifying certain professional strategies is to see how they would fit within a teacher education framework.

TPSR Teacher Education Programs

The pathway for professional preparation can vary from institution to institution and across cultures. Each university has their own approach to preparing their teachers. Regardless of the professional development framework they adopt, creating a competent and committed professional will be a common theme in all of them. If and when TPSR becomes a functional philosophy that guides the teacher education program, teacher education students may become personally and socially responsible as students first, then as professionals (Doolittle, 2011). For our purposes, we suggest that basic approaches be used to infuse the qualities of TPSR into some professional development experience.

As a preliminary step in the professional development process, university students will need to understand Don's work and TPSR. One way to do this is to have students read and discuss Don's book (*Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility through Physical Activity*, 2011) to get a full understanding about the model's assumptions and core values. This process may take place during the beginning of the students' program (perhaps the first two years) and aims to provide a foothold for moving to more advanced experiences incorporating the TPSR model. Don's reflections offered in the book should be paired with reflections about teacher education students' past experiences in PE (negative and positive ones), and why they want to teach PE. Further, within a discussion forum, students may also be exposed to current societal challenges such as intolerance and discrimination, youth's developmental needs in the 21st century and barriers towards teaching PE.

Additionally, an important goal for teacher education students is to first be responsible, self-directed and caring individuals in their university classes. Sarah Doolittle at a New York university urges her students to be punctual to classes, do good work, and to hand in assignments on time as a way of making them mindful of what responsibility means (Doolittle, 2011). Students may serve as mentors and help their peers throughout their university learning experience (e.g., help someone who struggles in a course or is new to the program). This is particularly important today considering the overemphasis given to results and performance in contemporary society. TPSR requires the future teacher to focus on the needs of others and put them first.

In the latter part of the PETE program students begin to see how TPSR works. This may be done two ways. One way is through peer teaching experiences which is usually part of one of the students' method courses. Although limited in the way TPSR works in the real world, peer teaching can give the

student an initial chance to plan and deliver lessons that connect to TPSR values/goals. This type of experience includes getting the student to follow the basic parts of a TPSR lesson: 1) having a large group meeting, 2) providing a TPSR-based physical activity experience, 3) having a large group meeting to discuss how the activity experience went, and 4) providing personal reflection time so students can evaluate how they did in the lesson. Peer teaching experiences also can serve as points for discussion among classmates and faculty about things that worked and things that will work. This approach also helps university teachers self-assess their ability to teach TPSR principles with teacher education students.

The peer teaching portion of the PETE program is then followed by "work shadow" experiences. Here's where community partnerships come into play. This requires that school and community site professionals are willing to have university students come out and observe a class. Focal points for the observation need to be in place (e.g., TPSR values observed, teacher's ability to maintain integrity of TPSR approach, kids' responses to the teacher, etc.). Obviously, it is important that some observed teachers have some grasp of the TPSR model and are able to apply it to their teaching experience. Seeing how TPSR values are or are not applied can provide an initial foundation for examining the future application of TPSR lessons.

The "work shadow" experience becomes a precursor to the next level of experience — the student-apprenticeships or site-based internships. Apprenticeships involve the use of a master teacher in TPSR. Students are directly involved in the master teacher's program and gradually take on the responsibility for leading various parts of the lesson until they can take over the entire lesson. The apprentice is also encouraged to eventually take on their own group within a program or establish new programs in other venues with supervision and one-on-one debriefing with the master teacher. This apprenticeship usually lasts for an entire semester. Observations, co-teaching, and extensive in-depth planning and debriefing with the master teacher and other apprentices are the pedagogical methods. The shared experiences help to bring the apprentice teacher closer to applying the TPSR model with a high degree of fidelity. The obvious shortcoming to this approach is that of finding a master teacher. This is especially challenging in contexts where TPSR is still novel and not widespread. One solution may be to have the apprenticeship take place with a faculty who has an expertise in TPSR programming. For example, Tom Martinek who apprenticed for a semester with Don Hellison provides three after-school programs that are all based of the TPSR model. These sites provide experiences that professionally prepare undergraduate and graduate students in TPSR programming and teaching in community-based programs. Similarly, Maria Baptista, who spent a semester at Tom Martinek's university learning about TPSR, now provides apprentice sites for her students at the university level in East Timor. And there is Dave Walsh, a past student of Hellison, who has developed a variety of apprenticeship options for his undergraduate students. These programs become centerpieces for undergraduate and graduate students who study sport-based youth development programming.

Another option is to have a methods class meet at a high school or model school site. This can be an

eight-week experience where students work with students at the school. As part of this format, it may be important to have the site at a school in an underserved community so the students have a chance to work with this particular population. This ensures that the students have exposure to a variety of populations. At the same time, they get to try out the TPSR approach and learn how students respond to it. Dave Walsh and Sarah Doolittle both have their methods and curriculum classes meet directly at a school each semester where they also look at ways the teaching experience may form an interest in working in schools in underserved neighborhoods. To make the structure work, it is important that the program is guided by a humane teacher who really cares about the students and preservice teachers. Guidance is important and by placing the students in a school where a program is dysfunctional and without guidance failure to get students excited about working with this population may occur. Debriefing can take place at the site and teacher education students get to know their students during the eight-week experience.

All of the ways to teach TPSR have one common and important quality to them — they all provide "hands on" experience which serves the purpose of bringing TPSR to life. The ability to analyze, plan, analyze again, and reflect provides an enriching and impressionable experience for the undergraduate student. The TPSR model must be tried out and "felt" and shared within real teaching scenarios. It takes the concept of values-based teaching from written ideas to action—learning is best done by doing. The choice of how one goes about choosing the best way is dependent on resources, time, and comfort level, as well as connections between the learner, communities and students. Either way, choosing the right approach pays off in creating a sustained and lasting understanding of what TPSR is all about and what it can do for kids.

Practical Implications

Developing TPSR experiences in a professional development program are not without challenges—some of these have been previously addressed in this article. Challenges that are related to on-site placements, course requirements, adopting different teaching styles, tapping into teacher education students' knowledge, and being realistic about how TPSR can be learned by teacher education students are all worth consideration. In this section, we provide several suggestions that may help programmers seeking to help students foster TPSR.

Accessing on-site Placements

Providing on-site experiential learning is such a powerful way for students to learn. And, yet, much has to go into setting up sites so that learning experience can be maximized and, at the same time, engage schools with a TPSR philosophy. It is equally important to create opportunities for students to experiment with TPSR, as well as connect with community programs and schools so TPSR is valued and deemed a feasible pursuit. An important starting point would be to negotiate with the school-based or after-school program staff. These negotiations help to solidify roles, resource availability, and scheduling between both parties. Doolittle (2011) suggests, that a written of "memo of understanding" helps to firm up the roles and expectations of both university and community parties. Concurrently,

training on TPSR could also be delivered. Such an approach may carve the way for program sustainability.

There are challenges in doing this. One of them is to be sure that the site (program) has some understanding of the TPSR approach. This is not always easy and sometimes requires some in-service training for the site teachers so they can get a handle on how the approach may be different from the "traditional" way it has been done. Also, knowing the scheduling of classes in the site schools is critical. Obviously, schools have set schedules for when class time occurs. Sometimes this will require some adjustment by the university so that clinical experience can be readily offered to university students. The number of students in the classes and the space in which teaching will take place will need to be known (i.e., outside, inside, shared space with other classes). The unexpected is always going to be an issue. Possible assemblies, teacher workdays, all-school testing will occur and can throw off the best of scheduling efforts by the faculty member (this is where a memorandum of understanding is important to have). A key factor for the university faculty member (and his/her students) is to be prepared for the unexpected. A common understanding in school teachers is that "flexibility" becomes their best ally in dealing with the "unexpected" in schools. This should be no less the case for university faculty and their students when engaging in school-based teaching. A helpful strategy is to establish long-lasting partnerships with sites so that each year faculty and site teachers acquire a collective awareness of the others' expectations and become more familiar and identified with TPSR.

Course Expectations and Teaching Styles

Many students have expectations of what a course should offer and how it will be played out during the semester. It is important to remember that students have been exposed to years and years of school PE teaching. In most cases, the traditional, competitive, top-down approach (i.e., teacher centered) of teaching has been well imprinted in their minds as a way to teach PE. This is why the instructors of professional courses need to explain clearly and authentically what the course experiences will be and what goals will be addressed. Unpredictable teaching situations, flexible lesson planning, and fluid goal setting may all present unfamiliar teaching situations in their professional development. These will be a challenge for the students since they often rely on predictable class activities. It may take time for the students to clearly understand the intent and purpose of the content and teaching approaches. Helping them understand that the TPSR approach provides a wonderful opportunity to engage in something worth doing — to help kids become responsible people. Empowering students is also crucial as they can be challenged by university teachers to host a seminar about TPSR, create a manual with sample activities and bring kids into university for activities. Considering the complex nature of changing course expectations and teaching styles, it may be necessary to reflect if and how TPSR may need to be infused in teacher education programs as a core philosophy. In other words, TPSR may not be viewed as a course and an approach that is used by one faculty member. Instead, TPSR may serve as the philosophical foundation for the entire program and for all faculty members. Although this may be complex, it is necessary to reflect about the need for pedagogical coherency within teacher education

41

programing. A faculty member may use a student-centered approach to foster understanding about TPSR. Many teachers, however, use more traditional approaches that perpetuate and validate students' previous experiences. Thus, TPSR may then become a difficult approach to grasp. Concurrently, other strategies may become inconsequential.

Informing Others

For some teacher education faculty on campus, the TPSR approach may be met with concern and a bit of defensiveness. Such an approach of changing the *status quo* may not be welcome. In addition, department chairs and P & T committee may not fully appreciate what it takes to develop learning experiences that are both applied and values-based (Doolittle, 2011). Many universities now support the concept of being a "community engaged institution" and, in fact, have acquired a *Carnegie Community Engaged Designation*. And yet, the realities of what that means is not fully understood. Alternative forms of scholarship, and service-learning initiatives especially in underserved neighborhoods may fall prey to more traditional ways of evaluating faculty productivity — for instance through the number of students, classes, events, and papers. However, progressive change can be enabled by getting buy-in from community members and thus leveraging the level of credibility and value for this form of scholarship. It may be important to engage schools and other types of organizations so TPSR is acknowledged as one possible approach for teaching PE that may help today's youth thrive. Within such climate, both students and community members may share similar expectations for programming and welcome a TPSR approach.

2. Conclusions

The purpose of this article is to provide insights about the processes behind the implementation of TPSR-focused teacher education programs. It should be noted that TPSR is one avenue that may work in a vast array of programs, but it is not the panacea or the best approach to development. Conversely, TPSR may become one approach that helps connect teacher education with youth's and community's needs, especially considering the current societal challenges such as Covid-19, discrimination, social justice and intolerance. A key point here is that any professional preparation program that is committed to a mission for preparing teachers will choose the best way to promote learning. We simply argue for the need to target youth's developmental needs in teacher education programs in a way that is meaningful for communities, as well as to increase transfer of learning and program sustainability. There are a variety of ways through which this objective can be achieved as we only outlined one. Careful consideration for community involvement, having a commitment to the TPSR model, being well informed about best practices, and getting the teacher education student to "step outside the box" are all important elements for success that help youth become tolerant, socially responsibility and able to contribute to society. The ultimate product will be a teacher who can ignite the spirit of TPSR in kids and contribute to communities.

Acknowledgements

References

Alcalá, D., Río, J., Calvo, G., & Pueyo, Á. (2019). Comparing effects of a TPSR training program on prospective physical education teachers' social goals, discipline and autonomy strategies in Spain, Chile and Costa Rica. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *24*(3), 220-232 http://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2018.1561837

Beale, A. (2016). Making a difference: TPSR: A new wave of youth development changes lives one stroke at a time. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, *87*(5), 31-34. http://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2016.1157392

Camerino, O., Valero-Valenzuela, A., Prat, Q., Sánchez, D., & Castañer, M. (2019). Optimizing education: A mixed methods approach oriented to teaching personal and social responsibility. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*(1). http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01439

Cardinal, B., Yan, Z., & Cardinal, M. (2013). Negative experiences in physical education and sport: How much do they affect physical activity participation later in life? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, *84*(3), 49-53. http://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2013.767736

Casey, A., & Larsson, H. (2018). "It's groundhog day": Foucault's governmentality and crisis discourses in physical education. *Quest*, *70*(4), 438-455 http://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2018.1451347

Curtner-Smith, M. D. (1999). The more things change the more they stay the same: Factors Influencing teachers' interpretations and delivery of national curriculum physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, *4*(1), 75-97. http://doi.org/10.1080/1357332990040106

Doolittle, S. (2011). TPSR in physical education teacher education: One teacher's exploration. In D. Hellion (Ed.), *Teaching personal and social responsibility through physical activity.* Campaign: IL: Human Kinetics.

Dunn, R., Doolittle, S. (2020). Professional development for teaching personal and social responsibility: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*. Advance online publication.

Dyson, B. (2014). Quality physical education: A commentary on effective physical education teaching. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *85*(2), 144-152. http://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2014.904155

Ennis, C. (2011). Physical education curriculum priorities: Evidence for education and skillfulness. *Quest*, *63*(1), 5-18. http://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2011.10483659

Escartí, A., Llopis-Goig, R., & Wright, P. (2018). Assessing the implementation fidelity of a school-based teaching personal and social responsibility program in physical education and other

subject areas. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *37* (1), 12-23. http://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2016-0200

Escartí, A., Pascual, C., Gutiérrez, M., Marín, D., Martínez, M., & Tarín, S. (2012). Applying the Teaching Personal and Social Responsibility Model (TPSR) in Spanish Schools Context: Lesson Learned. *Agora para la Educación Física y el Deporte*, *14*(2), 178-196.

Ezer, H., Gilat, I., & Sagee, R. (2010). Perception of teacher education and professional identity among novice teachers. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *33*(4), 391-404. http://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2010.504949

Farias, C., Hastie, P. A., & Mesquita, I. (2017). Towards a more equitable and inclusive learning environment in Sport Education: Results of an action research-based intervention. *Sport, Education and Society*, *22*(4), 460-476 http://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2015.1040752

Farias, C., Wallhead, T., & Mesquita, I. (2019). 'The Project changed my life': Sport education's transformative potential on student physical literacy. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, Advance online publication*. http://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2019.1661948

Fraser-Thomas, J., Côté, J., & Deakin, J. (2005). Youth sport programs: An avenue to foster positive youth development. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *10*(1), 19-40. http://doi.org/10.1080/1740898042000334890

Gordon, B. (2009). Merging teaching personal and social responsibility with sport education: A marriage made in heaven or hell? *Healthy Lifestyles Journal*, *56*(3), 13-16.

Hascher, T., & Hageauer, G. (2016). Openness to theory and its importance for preservice teachers' self-efficacy, emotions, and classroom behaviour in the teaching practicum. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *77*, 15-25.

Hellison. (2011). *Teaching personal and social responsability through physical activity* (3th ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hellison, D., & Wright, P. (2002). Retention in an urban extended day program: A process-based approach. *Journal of Teaching Physical Education*, *22*, 369-381. http://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.22.4.369

Hemphill, Templin, T. J., & Wright, P. M. (2015). Implementation and outcomes of a responsibility-based continuing professional development protocol in physical education. *Sport, Education and Society*, *20*(3), 1-22. http://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2012.761966

Jacobs, J., Casteneda, A., & Casteneda, R. (2016). Sport-based youth and community development: Beyond the ball. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, *87*(5), 31-3418-22. http://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2016.1157386

Lopes, A., & Pereira, F. (2012). Everyday life and everyday learning: the ways in which pre-service teacher education curriculum can encourage personal dimensions of teacher identity. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *35*(1), 17-38. http://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2011.633995

44

Martinek, T. (2016). Project Effort: Creating responsible leadership through values-based learning. *Active and Health Magazine*, *23*(2/3), 43-46.

Martinek, & Hellison, D. (2009). *Youth Leadership in Sport and Physical Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Martinek, & Hellison, D. (2016). Teaching personal and social responsibility: Past, present and future. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, *87*(5), 9-13. http://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2016.1157382

McCarthy, J., & Alteri, V. (2016). The TPSR alliance: Learning with a family who won't give up on you. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, *87*(5), 23-26.

McLennan, N., & Thompson, J. (2015). *Quality physical education (QPE). Guidelines for policy-makers*. Paris, France: UNESCO.

Merino-Barrero, J., Pedreño, N., Valenzuela, A., & Fernandez-Rio, J. (2019). Impact of a sustained TPSR program on students' responsibility, motivation, sportsmanship, and intention to be physically active. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, Advance online publication.

Metzler, M. (2011). *Instructional models for physical education*. Massachusetts, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Rink, J. (2013). *Teaching physical education*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Severinsen, G. (2014). Teaching personal and social responsibility to juniors through physical education. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport and Physical Education*, *5*(1), 83-100.

Siedentop, D., & Tannehill, D. (2000). *Developing Teaching Skills in Physical Education* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Simmons, J., & MacLean, J. (2018). Physical education teachers' perceptions of factors that inhibit and facilitate the enactment of curriculum change in a high-stakes exam climate. *Sport, Education and Society*, *23*(2), 186-202. http://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2016.1155444

Walsh, D., Veri, M., & Willard, J. (2015). The kinesiology career club: Undergraduate student mentor perspectives of a TPSR program. *Physical Educator*, *72*, 317-339.

Wright, P., & Irwin, C. (2018). Using systematic observation to assess teacher effectiveness promoting personally and socially responsible behavior in physical education. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, *22*(3), 250-262. http://doi.org/10.1080/1091367X.2018.1429445

Yli-Piipari, S. (2014). Physical education curriculum reform in Finland. *Quest*, *66*(4), 468-484. http://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2014.948688